

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 3:24-cr-00151
)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
MATTHEW ISAAC KNOOT)	

ORDER

Via an order entered on May 14, 2025 (Doc. No. 65), the Court directed the Government to advise “whether, as Docket No. 57 might suggest, it is *anticipated or at least possible* that additional discovery may be provided to Defendant.” (*Id.* at 1) (emphasis added). The next day, the Government notified the Court that it “does not *anticipate* production of any further discovery to the Defendant.” (Doc. No. 67 at 1) (emphasis added). However, the Government did not provide its view as to whether additional discovery was at least *possible*. Because such a possibility (even if a remote one)—seems to the undersigned be the very basis of the motion reflected at Docket No. 57—i.e., that the Government should not have filed such a motion unless production of further discovery potentially could be the end result of the resolution of such motion, if the Court’s view of certain information differed from the view of the Government—the Government shall advise the Court by May 19, 2025 if production of additional discovery remains at least *possible* pending the ultimate outcome of the Motion at Docket No. 57.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE